

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the application, no claims currently stand allowed and claims 1 – 31 stand rejected. Claims 1 – 5, 8, 11 – 15, 18, 21 – 25, 28, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by “Performance Engineering of Software Systems” by Smith (“Smith”). Claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of “The Routing Table” by Anderson (“Routing Table”). Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith when combined with Routing Table in view of “High Performance Computing” by Kerbyson (“Kerbyson”).

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 have been amended to include a further clarification that the source and destination of the active message are a “source network node” and a “destination network node”.

Before turning to the specific claim language, the Applicant believes a short synopsis of the invention might be useful. The specification teaches in particular embodiments a method for modeling the execution of distributed processes on networks, taking into consideration delays encountered during the transmission of messages between processing nodes over a network connection. As is explained on page 4 of the specification, beginning at line 4, the model is based upon a particular network topology executing a specified model load. This model load is a communication workload definition, which, as is further explained on page 11 of the specification, beginning at line 14, characterizes the events that affect the communication status of the network connecting various processing nodes.

In contrast to the Applicant’s invention, the Smith reference teaches a method for predicting software performance, involving the construction of a model of software execution

which can be solved for indicative performance metrics. The method and model in Smith is practiced exclusively within a single computing system.

The Office action references Figure 5.4 of the Smith reference to illustrate that Smith teaches generating a routing structure based upon a network configuration. Even if one were to accept this statement, the queuing network model in Smith is explicitly defined for at most a sole computer system (i.e., the model consists of a central processing unit and input/output subsystems and does not disclose internetworked nodes).

Accordingly previously pending independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 have been amended to incorporate the limitation that the source and destination of the active message are a “source network node” and a “destination network node”.

Applicant’s amended claims require that the routing structure used is based on a network configuration comprising at least a source network node and a destination network node. Such an arrangement is not described or even remotely suggested by the Smith reference, nor is it suggested by the combination of the Smith reference with the Routing Table and / or Kerbyson references. This is necessarily true as the model in Smith does not possess multiple network nodes and, similarly, does not possess any network connectivity to facilitate communication with another network node. The Routing Table and Kerbyson references also lack any such teaching. At most, the teachings of the Smith reference can only be extended to a method of predicting delays in a execution on a single, stand-alone system. Such a method has nothing to do with modeling the execution of distributed processes on networks, taking into consideration delays encountered during the transmission of messages between processing nodes over a network.


All of the pending claims now either include language explaining that the source and destination of the active message are a source network node and a destination network node or depend from claims that include such language. Therefore, the Applicant submits that the rejections in the Office action have been rendered moot. As this technique for modeling the execution of distributed processes on networks, taking into consideration delays encountered during the transmission of messages between processing nodes over a network connection is not discussed in, nor rendered obvious by, the cited art, the Applicant further submits that all of the pending claims are now allowable.

In re Appln. of PAPAEFSIATHIOU
Application No. 09/632,522
Reply to Office action of March 11, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott H. Schuller, Reg. No. 53,568
One of the Attorneys for Applicants
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 8, 2004